UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

-vs- Case No. 16-MJ-58-SLC

ADRIAN JAIMES, Madison, Wisconsin June 14, 2016

Defendant. 3:00 p.m.

STENOGRAPHIC TRANSCRIPT OF AUDIO RECORDING

DETENTION HEARING

HELD BEFORE THE HONORABLE STEPHEN L. CROCKER,

## APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

Office of the United States Attorney BY: ELIZABETH ALTMAN
Assistant United States Attorney 660 West Washington Avenue Madison, Wisconsin 53703

For the Defendant:

Federal Defender Services of Wisconsin Madison Branch Office
BY: PETER MOYERS
22 East Mifflin Street, Ste. 1000
Madison, Wisconsin 53703

Also appearing:

Adrian Jaimes - defendant Ryan Plender - US Probation Officer

Lynette Swenson RMR, CRR, CRC
U.S. District Court Federal Reporter
United States District Court
120 North Henry Street, Rm. 520
Madison, Wisconsin 53703
608-255-3821

## I-N-D-E-X DEFENDANT'S WITNESSES EXAMINATION PAGES RUTH JAIMES Direct by Mr. Moyers 10 - 12CATALINO JAIMES Direct by Mr. Moyers 13-15 (Proceedings called to order.) THE CLERK: Case Number 16-MJ-58-SLC. United 9 10 States of America v. Adrian Jaimes. Court is called for a detention hearing. May we have the appearances, 11 please. 12 13 MS. ALTMAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. The United States appears by Elizabeth Altman. 14 15 MR. MOYERS: Peter Moyers from Federal Defender Services and seated here to my right is Mr. Jaimes. 16 17 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Jaimes, good afternoon to you. 18 19 THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon. 20 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Moyers, Ms. Altman, 21 good afternoon to both of you. We also have Mr. Plender here on behalf of Pretrial Services. Good afternoon. 22 AGENT: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 23 24 THE COURT: Thank you. All right. We're here

for a hearing on Mr. Jaimes's motion for release on

conditions made orally at the initial appearance. I've received and read the Pretrial Service report, and Mr. Moyers, I just want to confirm with you and I'm checking the docket, you did not file any sort of a written release plan; correct?

MR. MOYERS: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Did you want to proceed orally this afternoon?

MR. MOYERS: Yes, I would.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's just confirm, have you had a chance to look at the Pretrial Service report and talk to Mr. Jaimes about it?

MR. MOYERS: Yes. I've had a chance and we discussed it.

THE COURT: Okay. Fair enough. Ms. Altman, I presume you've read it as well?

MS. ALTMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And again, simply to make the record, Mr. Moyers, we talked about this briefly at the initial appearance. Did you want a probable cause finding by the Court or are you willing to concede probable cause for the purpose of today's hearing?

MR. MOYERS: We're not asking you to dismiss the Complaint, but we would like to talk about the evidence in the case and the Complaint vis-a-vis detention.

THE COURT: Understood. But let's be clear, you're certainly entitled to do that and the Court would welcome that, but on a finding of probable cause based on the Complaint, then the burden under the Bail Reform Act is on Mr. Jaimes through counsel to prove that he's neither a flight risk nor a danger and I assume from what you're telling me that you accept that finding.

MR. MOYERS: Yes. That that would be our burden?

THE COURT: Correct. That's all I'm saying.

MR. MOYERS: Yep. That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. Then let's proceed.

Mr. Moyers, how would you like to present your plan?

MR. MOYERS: I guess first things first. I'll go through -- we'll go through the evidence or at least the affidavit and then we'll move on to the Pretrial Services report --

THE COURT: As you wish.

MR. MOYERS: -- with -- as a matter of probable cause or evidence here, I would point out that the affidavit attached to the Complaint doesn't really get us to probable cause.

THE COURT: Mr. Moyers, let me stop you there.

We're not going to start at the beginning. If and when

you ever want to file a motion to suppress or to quash a

warrant, that would be the appropriate time. According to the Pretrial Service report, Mr. Jaimes admitted that he had done this, admitted that there were multiple victims, and they found over 100 pictures of minor victims on his computer. That's the starting point.

MR. MOYERS: So the Court is not interested in whether the affidavit was sufficient to issue the Complaint in the first place?

THE COURT: Exactly right. Exactly right. Please continue.

MR. MOYERS: Okay. Well, in that case, Your Honor, with the Pretrial Services report, what we have here is, as I understand it, the probation office thinks they can mitigate the risk of flight. So what we're really focused on here is dangerousness and our position is that the reasoning of the Pretrial Services report isn't terrific. First of all, it proves too much. Basically the upshot of what they're saying is well, given -- here I'm reading from page three, this is Docket No. 4, "Assessment of Danger. Given the ubiquity of mobile devices with access to the internet and the difficulty inherent in monitoring those devices, there is a significant risk that the defendant could continue the behavior alleged in the complaint undetected." That's going to apply to anybody who uses a mobile device,

tablet to engage -- to transmit contraband or images of child pornography or videos over the internet.

And I would point out that this same argument would apply to almost anything else. For instance, given the ubiquity of guns and the difficulty inherent in monitoring all those guns, there's a significant risk that the defendant could continue the behavior alleged in the complaint undetected. Or given the ubiquity of banks and the difficulty inherent in monitoring all those banks, there's a significant risk that the defendant could continue to rob banks as alleged in the complaint.

THE COURT: Well, I understand the rhetorical device of reductio ad absurdeum, but it's a nonsequitur here. The ubiquity of electronic devices is palpable and the question is not is that an incorrect statement, because it is a correct statement. The question is how do we account for that risk here.

MR. MOYERS: Well, I think that you can tailor a number of conditions. First of all, you can forbid him from using anything connected to the internet. That's the first condition.

Second of all, we can have -- and I'm going to ask his parents to come up and testify to tell you that they would be willing and motivated to report to Mr. Plender if they ever saw him with any device. As their testimony

will show when I have them come up here, Mr. Jaimes works with his father at the same -- for the same employer.

His dad is the head chef at the Bull's Eye Country Club.

Mr. Jaimes is a server and bartender.

Now, his mother was working until recently, but she was laid off from Head Start in Wood County. So she's home a lot of the time now. The point being is that there are going to be people around him a lot. It's not as if we're sending him to some home on his own where we'll just have to -- you know, where we'll just have to rely on a rule like don't use the internet. Here there will be people looking at him all the time.

Second of all, you can impose a house arrest or a curfew or just locations that he can go to to make sure that he's not around anything where he would have access to the internet. And if he's just working or at home and you can take the internet out of the home, then we've got a lot of -- then he would have to go through some sort of Herculean effort to get to the internet without his parents knowing to commit this crime. And I think there we've minimized it about as far as we can. Now, whether -- the reason that should be sufficient is look, he's got no other criminal history before. It's not like he's been engaging in criminal behavior all of his life.

Second of all, I don't have any evidence yet, at

least from the government, that he's -- that there are any sort of other offenses or related sexual or contact offenses that would pose other kinds of problems.

THE COURT: And let me just make sure I'm tracking here.

MR. MOYERS: Yeah.

THE COURT: The Complaint is limited to the one known victim.

MR. MOYERS: Yes.

THE COURT: According to the Pretrial Service report, and the Court doesn't get the reports and I'm not sure if you've seen them yet either, but apparently Mr. Jaimes admitted that there were five or six other victims and apparently there's images of five other victims. So when you tell me there's no evidence of other conduct, are you excluding this or are you including that?

 $$\operatorname{MR.\ MOYERS:}$  No hands-on contact. So maybe that was unclear.

THE COURT: It was. Okay.

MR. MOYERS: Okay. Yeah. There's no other hands-on contact. But yeah, I take it that the Court understands that they -- that according to the -- he said five or six more. They found four additional more in the online drop box is my understanding. So it's a total of

five over the period. Frankly one or five, I don't think that changes the dangerousness calculation. Maybe a little for multiple victims, but I think it's the behavior itself that the Court has to assess. And look, if we take the internet out of the house, we give him house arrest, we have his -- you know, we have, you know, just a blanket bright-line rule no using any device that connects to the internet, we've minimized substantially, I would argue, the idea that he'll go out and reoffend. So if the Court would like or I don't know if the Court wants to hear from Ms. Altman first, but I'd like to call his parents to testify.

THE COURT: Well, certainly that's your prerogative. Of course you're welcome to do that. What I'd like you to do is present your entire argument for release first and, of course, Ms. Altman will get a chance to cross-examine if she chooses to. And I'll let Mr. Plender ask nonleading -- well, he can ask whatever questions he wants on behalf of Pretrial Services. But then once you're completely done with your testimony and any additional argument you'd like to make, then I'll give the floor to Ms. Altman.

 $$\operatorname{MR.\ MOYERS:}$$  Understood. Then I'll call them now.

THE COURT: Please do.

```
MR. MOYERS: We'd call Ruth Jaimes to the stand.
           RUTH JAIMES, DEFENDANT'S WITNESS, SWORN,
                       DIRECT EXAMINATION
   BY MR. MOYERS:
 5
        Would you please state your name for the court and
 6
    spell your last.
    Α
        Ruth Jaimes. J-a-i-m-e-s.
 8
        And you're Adrian Jaimes's -- the defendant's
 9
   mother; is that correct?
10
   Α
        Yes, I am.
11
        And you live with him in Nekoosa?
        Yes.
12
   Α
        Has he lived with you all of his life?
13
   Q
14
   Α
        Yes.
15
        And how long have you lived in that house in
16
   Nekoosa?
17
        Little over ten years.
        And you're aware of what he's been charged with; is
18
19
   that correct?
20
   Α
        Yes.
21
        And you understand that the minimum penalty is 15
   years?
22
        Yes, I'm aware.
23
   Α
        And that the maximum would be 30 years.
24
25
    Α
        Yes.
```

```
Now, do you -- are you also aware that if he were
    able to get out on pretrial release and committed another
 3
    crime, that there would be additional penalties?
        Yes, I am aware. I wouldn't allow that to happen.
   Α
 5
        All right. You love your son, don't you?
 6
    Α
        Yes, very much.
        But would you lie to Mr. Plender or any officer of
 8
   the court to help him?
 9
        No, I wouldn't.
10
        Why not?
   Q
11
        Because I wouldn't want to get myself in trouble and
   he shouldn't make another mistake.
12
        Would you be willing to remove the internet from
13
14
   your home?
15
        Yes. It's in my name and I will disconnect it in a
   half hour if I could or if I have to.
16
17
        And would you be willing to call Mr. Plender or any
18
    court officer if you saw your son on any internet- --
19
        Yes I would.
20
        -- capable device? And so can you look the judge in
   the eye and tell him that you would be willing to do
21
   whatever it -- whatever was necessary, including report
22
   him to Mr. Plender --
23
24
        Yes.
   Α
25
        -- if you had to?
```

```
I would do anything. Anything.
   Α
 2
             THE COURT: And Mr. Moyers, whenever a mother or
 3
    father tells me these things, I always believe them.
    Okay?
          So we don't really need to establish that. Let's
    descend into the specifics if you've got them.
   BY MR. MOYERS:
 6
         You've been laid off; is that correct?
 8
   Α
         Yes.
 9
         And you're home most of the day?
    Q
10
   Α
        Yes.
         You have two other daughters in the house?
11
        Yes.
12
   Α
        How old are they?
13
   Q
        22 and 14.
14
   Α
15
        And is the 14-year-old still in school?
   Q
         Yeah. Well, she's out for the summer, but yes.
16
   Α
17
         So you're at home for most of the day?
         Yes, I am. I haven't been going nowhere. I don't
18
   Α
19
   normally do.
20
   Q
         And you sleep there at night?
21
   Α
         Yes.
22
             MR. MOYERS: No further questions.
             THE COURT: Ms. Altman, did you have any
23
24
    questions?
25
             MS. ALTMAN: No.
                               Thank you.
```

```
THE COURT: Mr. Plender?
             AGENT: No, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Jaimes, I don't either.
   So you're done. Thank you. Did you want to call the
   father?
            MR. MOYERS: Just for the employment part.
             THE COURT: As you wish.
         (Witness excused.)
             MR. MOYERS: We will call Catalino Jaimes.
 9
10
         CATALINO JAIMES, DEFENDANT'S WITNESS, SWORN,
                      DIRECT EXAMINATION
11
   BY MR. MOYERS:
12
        Please state your name and spell your last for the
13
14
   court.
15
        My name is Catalino Jaimes. J-a-i-m-e-s.
   Α
16
        Mr. Jaimes, where are you employed?
   Q
        Bull's Eye Country Club.
17
   Α
        And where is the Bull's Eye Country Club?
18
   Q.
19
   Α
        In Wisconsin Rapids.
20
   Q
        About how far is that from your home?
21
        Seven, eight minutes.
   Α
22
        And does your son, Adrian Jaimes, work there as
   well?
23
24
   Α
        Yes.
25
        And what does he do?
```

```
He's a server and a bartender.
   Α
         Do you see him when you --
    Q
 3
         All the time.
    Α
        Let me finish.
    Q
 5
    Α
        Sorry.
 6
    Q
         Do you see him at work?
         Yeah.
   Α
         And do you go to work every day?
 8
 9
        Five, six days a week, sometimes seven depending on
10
   how busy we are for the summer.
11
        And how many days a week or hours per week does your
   son work?
12
13
        At the moment anywhere from 30 to 35. Again,
    sometimes five days a week, up to 45 to 50 depending on
14
   the week.
15
        And what part of the day do you usually work?
16
        I work 9 to 5 normally. Or when we have parties on
17
   the weekend it can go up to 8, 9, 10 o'clock at night.
18
19
         And when does -- when does Adrian typically work?
20
        He works lunch hours or dinner hours.
21
        And I'll just ask would you be willing to report any
   violation of any condition to Mr. Plender or any court
22
    officer --
23
24
        Yes.
   Α
25
         -- if he broke it?
```

```
Α
        Yes.
            MR. MOYERS: No further questions.
            THE COURT: Ms. Altman, any questions?
            MS. ALTMAN: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
            THE COURT: Mr. Plender.
            AGENT: No, Your Honor.
            THE COURT: I don't either. Mr. Jaimes, thank
8
   you. You may resume your seat as well.
9
         (Witness excused at 3:19 p.m.)
10
            THE COURT: Mr. Moyers, do you have other
11
   witnesses you wanted to present?
            MR. MOYERS: No, Your Honor.
12
13
            THE COURT: Do you have any additional argument
   at this time before we hear from the government.
14
15
            MR. MOYERS: Just a little bit to make it very
   clear because I want to focus in. The conditions we're
16
17
   proposing is, of course, the standard ones that we would
   have in any case like this. But that they would get the
18
19
   internet -- they would remove the internet from the
20
   house; that there's just a complete ban on any device,
21
   whether or not it is hooked up to the internet, that he
22
   can't be using it. I don't even want him even internet
23
   capable. And we would suggest some sort of curfew or
24
   house arrest to keep him at either work or at home or
```

religious services, if any, or to see me.

With that kind of lockdown, I think the Court can have more than enough confidence that the risk here has been mitigated.

THE COURT: All right. Well, thank you for your input. Ms. Altman, your input, please.

MS. ALTMAN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. I'll just start out by saying I have no doubt about the defendant's parents' wishes and I don't doubt that they want what's best for their son and that they would call Mr. Plender or the Court if they saw a violation. That, however, in this particular case just simply is not enough.

First of all, with regard to the nonappearance, I understand that the Court thinks that it could or that probation thinks that it could be mitigated. This is a 15-year mandatory minimum and a 21-year-old kid. I think he's got a pretty good incentive to not show up. Are there some things that could mitigate that? Sure. GPS. But if someone were to cut the GPS and make a run for it, we simply know the last place they were.

That, of course, is not the primary consideration, the primary issue that he should be detained, and that is, of course, the danger to the community based on his offense, and then I'll talk about why the plan doesn't mitigate it.

As the Court has already mentioned and everybody is aware, there are several victims in this case, not just the one that started the investigation. The agents found at least four other boys' images contained within a folder labeled Kix vids. We know he's on Kix looking for other victims. There were images of our known victim from the complaint and the search warrant in there. And I can't tell you that they are all child pornography. It says the video — the folder contains 157 images with them being faces, behinds and genitals. So of those, they're obviously not all going to qualify as child pornography. But that does not negate the fact that there are five child victims of this defendant.

As the Court may recall from the search warrant, this defendant did not take no for an answer very easily. He was very persistent in his communications with the victim in this case. The victim saying no, I don't want to send you any more pictures and the defendant saying please. One more. One last one. You'd make me the happiest girl on earth. The child says gosh, is that a little hard core. And the defendant says please, because you like me. And at the point when the child in this case ended the contact, that was not enough for the defendant. He then took on a different persona to continue to encourage the child in this case to continue

sending pictures to him. So he doesn't really take no for an answer. I'm not sure that he's going to take what this Court says as an answer either.

Ultimately, in addition to the danger, the problem is the plan. I understand the parents are going to be around him a lot, but I disagree with defense counsel that it's going to take a Herculean effort for him to violate a court order and to get back online, back on Kix, back in communication with these children. You can stop by a Best Buy and buy a prepaid phone on your way home from work and you're back in business.

The defendant essentially proposes to continue his regular routine, albeit with some house arrest or staying home after dinner, but that still puts him in a country club, outside of his parents' view. The dad, I believe, testified that he worked until 5 and defendant is there dinner hours, so he's there without his father often or at least occasionally. And even when his father is there, his father is busy in the kitchen. I'm certain he's not seeing all of the interactions that the defendant is having with citizens, with people, with someone who could bring him a phone, with children in the country club that he could make contact with or befriend. I just don't see this plan at all being feasible based on its -- I don't want to say laxity, but sort of laxity,

and the crimes itself show that he is a danger to the community, crimes themselves, I guess. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Plender, your report I think speaks for itself. Did you want to add anything in light of what you've heard so far from Mr. Moyers or Ms. Altman? AGENT: No, Your Honor. Nothing has changed our 8 recommendation at all. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Well, Mr. Moyers, 10 then I'll let you reply before I give you a ruling. 11 Anything else you'd like to offer in reply to the government's response to your plan? 12 13 MR. MOYERS: Just two items, Your Honor. first is to the extent the Court is going to rely on a 14 15 search warrant that it may or may not have signed in that affidavit that I haven't seen --16 17 THE COURT: You haven't seen the affidavit yet? MR. MOYERS: For the search warrant? 18 19 THE COURT: Yeah. 20 MR. MOYERS: No. 21 MS. ALTMAN: I thought you had it last week. 22 THE COURT: You should have gotten it at the 23 initial appearance.

MR. MOYERS: I got a search warrant. I did not

24

25

get an affidavit.

THE COURT: Okay. What were you going to run me through then when I cut you off and said that we're not dealing with probable cause? The Complaint?

MR. MOYERS: I thought I was going to go through

THE COURT: Okay.

the Complaint --

MR. MOYERS: -- and the arrest warrant.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, they're very similar.

MR. MOYERS: I gathered they might be.

THE COURT: Well, certainly you're entitled to that. But in any event, let's keep going today.

MR. MOYERS: And look, I don't know. I can't tell you. But if there are further facts about how he wouldn't take no for an answer or about his conduct here, I don't think the Court should rely on it certainly until I've seen it.

And second of all, to describe this plan as lax I think is too much. I think what the -- we -- the focus of what the Court would be struggling with here is given the gravity of this kind of crime and that there are just internet devices, ready-internet devices are easy to purchase, I wouldn't call them inexpensive, but it can be done, whether or not there's just -- there are conditions the Court can design or that are practically realizable. And I think what we've got here is the sort of scenarios

that the government is suggesting of now sneaking out, I don't know, between tables at work or stopping by, you know, Best Buy when he's on GPS monitoring. You could even say that his mom or dad has to drive him to and from work. That's minimizing it and I mean it's restricting his — restricting his movement and even just generally his, like his behavior, his conduct, what he can actually do to such a degree that the Court should have tons of confidence that the risk here has been minimized.

input, Mr. Moyers. And you've done the best job you can with what you've got so far. I'm not going to release Mr. Jaimes today and I'll explain my thought process momentarily. But I want to make clear that this is subject to reconsideration as more information becomes available to everybody: To you, to the government, and to Pretrial Services. And I don't know, it may go the other direction. It may be that we learn more things that make Mr. Jaimes even more of a risk for release, but at least hypothetically there could be a plan. But this isn't it.

So let's back up a bit. The Court often describes releasing a defendant on a plan as a two-way street.

You've got to have a good plan, but you also have to have a defendant whom the Court trusts enough to follow the

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We don't know enough about Mr. Jaimes, Mr. Adrian Jaimes, for the Court to do that. Right now he's a syper to the court. He's 21 years old. He's presumed innocent of the charges. There hasn't even been an Indictment yet. But for the purposes of probable cause and based on the information in the Complaint, it appears that Mr. Jaimes engaged in very calculated, manipulative behavior. I think devious is not too strong a word; pretending to be two different people in order to triangulate his victim, both the brother and the sister who each would wheedle and cajole the victim to send more pictures. That's very manipulative. That's very clever in an evil way. So what makes him tick? What makes the Court think that he wouldn't manipulate or be devious or try to wheedle his way out of conditions or keep doing what he's doing?

Following at that same path a little bit further, we don't know the depth of his need or wish to look at pictures of prepubescent boys. Apparently, and again he's presumed innocent of charges and certainly there's no complaint or Indictment charging any of these other victims, but apparently he collects the pictures. He's got over 100 images, not all of which would qualify as child pornography, but it's not enough to have one. He's very similar to a defendant named Thomas Valley who was

in this court who took on false personae to wheedle his victims into sending him naked pictures. Again, a man who had ultimately what were found by a professional to be very serious psychological problems.

So a prerequisite for the Court to consider releasing Mr. Jaimes would be an evaluation by a trained professional. What are we dealing with here? Who is Adrian Jaimes? Can we trust him? What sorts of sociological or psychological problems are we dealing with here? Now, Mr. Jaimes doesn't have to submit to that. He's got a right to say no. But he's not getting out until the Court has some trained professional tell us can we trust him or not. Are there personality disorders, other psychological problems or something that either can or cannot be addressed? That's the first step.

If we get there from here, and the Court is willing to countenance the fact that we will, we have to have a tighter plan. I'll invoke Mr. Huartt. He was in a halfway house. Somehow he got access to a contraband cell phone and was looking at pornography on a cell phone in a halfway house under the tightest possible restrictions. He was in lockdown and yet he still got access to somebody's phone. It happens all the time. You'd like to think it can't, you'd like to think it

doesn't, but I don't think Ms. Altman is out of line by saying that burner phones are easy to get.

If you're working in a bar at a country club, you can borrow someone's phone to call home and next thing you know you've dialed up an internet site. We would have to account for things that tightly here because we just don't know what Mr. Adrian Jaimes would want to do or is capable of doing and we would have to account for all of that.

Like the government, I very much trust his parents. I think that they are very well intentioned and I trust them to do whatever they need to do. But today's concern is the Court doesn't know what we need them to do. We need to find out. We need to find out more about what's going on here and what's making their son do the things he's alleged to have done. Because I'm also going to assume they had no idea that this was happening, that this is a complete shock and a mystery to them. And I don't hold that against them, but we have to deal with the reality that confronts all of us today. Okay?

So I'm going to grant the government's motion. The presumption has not been rebutted today. I'll leave the door open. I'm not going to set deadlines on anything. Mr. Moyers, if you want to follow this path a little bit further, you can talk to Pretrial Services. If you want

```
to get your own psych eval for whatever purpose, that's
   your prerogative. You've got resources. But just keep
   the Court in the loop if you want the Court to do
   anything. But today the answer is no, Mr. Jaimes is
   staying in custody. Okay?
        That's all I've got. Mr. Moyers, anything else
   today before we adjourn?
             MR. MOYERS: No, Your Honor.
 9
             THE COURT: Anything else on behalf of the
10
   government?
11
            MS. ALTMAN: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
             THE COURT: Anything else on behalf of Pretrial?
12
13
                     No, Your Honor. Thank you.
             AGENT:
             THE COURT: Then we're done for today. Thank
14
   you all.
15
        (Proceedings concluded at 3:33 p.m.)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

I, LYNETTE SWENSON, Certified Realtime and Merit
Reporter in and for the State of Wisconsin, certify that
the foregoing is a true and accurate transcription of the
audio recording of the proceedings held on the 14th day
of June 2016 before the Honorable Stephen L. Crocker,
Magistrate Judge for the Western District of Wisconsin.
Dated this 23rd day of June 2016.

\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_

Lynette Swenson, RMR, CRR, CRC Federal Court Reporter

The foregoing certification of this transcript does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the direct control and/or direction of the certifying court reporter.